DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 844 AA 000 325

The Views of 920 PACE Project Directors.
Fairfax County Public Schools, Va. Center for Effecting Educational Change.
Pub Date 20 Nov 68
Note- 77p.; Report Number 5 of The Second National Study of PACE.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.05
Descriptors- *Evaluation Methods, *Evaluation Techniques, *Program Proposals, *Research Proposals
Identifiers- PACE, Projects to Advance Creativity in Education

The purpose of this research is to provide an overall view of PACE, as seen by project directors. The discussion is concerned with characteristics of the existing projects; problems encountered; views toward state, local and federal agencies, criteria for evaluation and funding; and ideas for the future. The study points out basic facts about the projects and basic relationships between different types of projects. The survey instrument covers the six major areas: (A) Problems in project operation. (B) Relationships to local milieu. (C) Relationships to state departments. (D) Relationships to federal agencies. (E) Evaluation of PACE. (F) Future developments of PACE. (JL)

THE VIEWS
OF
920 PACE PROJECT DIRECTORS

Report No. 5
of
The Second National Study of PACE

November 20, 1968

THE VIEWS

OF

920 PACE PROJECT DIRECTORS

Report No. 5

of

The Second National Study of PACE

November 20, 1968

Reports of the Second National Study of PACE

1. Evaluation and "PACE": A Study of Procedures and Effectiveness of Evaluation Sections in Approved PACE Projects with Recommendations for Improvement. February 29, 1968. 270 pp.

2. The Continuation and Strengthening of ESEA Title III. March 4, 1968. 2 pp.

3. A Comprehensive Model for Managing an ESEA Title III Project from Conception to Culmination. November 10, 1968. 90 pp.

4. Analysis and Evaluation of 137 ESEA Title III Planning and Operational Grants. November 15, 1968. 69 pp.

5. The Views of 920 PACE Project Directors. November 20, 1968. 67 pp.

6. PACE: Catalyst for Change. November 29, 1968. 258 pp.

SECOND PACE NATIONAL STUDY

(1967-1968)

Special Consultants

William M. Alexander
Director, Institute for Curriculum Improvement
College of Education
University of Florida

Glenn O. Blough
Professor of Education
University of Maryland

Don Bushnell
Vice President and Director
Research and Development
Brooks Foundation
Santa Barbara, California

Don Davies
Former Executive Secretary,
National Commission on
Teacher Education and Professional Standards
National Education Association

Lloyd M. Dunn
Director, Institute on Mental
Retardation and Intellectual
Development
George Peabody College for Teachers

Elliot W. Eisner
Associate Professor of Education
and Art
School of Education
Stanford University

James D. Finn
Chairman, Department of
Instructional Technology
University of Southern California

Dorothy Fraser
Coordinator of Social
Science
College of Education
Hunter College of the City
University of New York

Egon G. Guba
Director, National Institute for the Study of
Educational Change
Indiana University

Robert J. Havighurst
Professor of Education
School of Education
University of Chicago

Maurie Hillson
Professor of Education
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers, The State University

Arthur A. Hitchcock
Professor of Education
State University of New
York at Albany

Norman D. Kurland
Director, Center on Innovation in Education
The State Education Department
Albany, New York

John W. Letson
Superintendent of Schools
Atlanta Public Schools

A. Harry Passow
Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Joseph B. Rubin
Teacher, Chapman Elementary School
Portland, Oregon

Wilbur Schramm
Director, Institute for Communication Research
Stanford University

Ira J. Singer
Assistant Superintendent
West Hartford Public Schools

Robert E. Stake
Associate Director, Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
University of Illinois

Special Advisors

Harold B. Gores
President, Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc.
New York, New York

Donald W. Johnson
Former Director, Program Planning and Development
California State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

Daniel L. Stufflebeam
Director, The Evaluation Center
The Ohio State University

PACE Project Directors' Advisory Group

Robert L. Hammond
Former Director, Project EPIC
Tucson, Arizona

Arthur R. King
Director, Hawaiian Curriculum Center
State Department of Education
Honolulu, Hawaii

Donald R. Miller
Director, Operation PEP
Burlingame, California

George G. Tankard, Jr.
Director, Center for Effecting Educational Change
Fairfax, Virginia

Shelley Umans
Director, PACE Activities for New York City
New York, New York

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
BACKGROUND		2
PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS		5
	Scope of project	5
	Area served	5
	Type of activity	6
	Classification of project	8
	Operational budget	8
	The "average" project	9
PROJECT OPERATION		11
	Four most difficult problems	11
		Correlation with type of project	14
		Correlation with region	14
	Primary factors in approving new projects	15
		Correlation with area served	16
		Correlation with region	17
	Criteria for evaluating project effectiveness	18
		Correlation of "constructive change" with scope of project	21
		Correlation of "constructive change" with size of budget	21
STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONSHIPS		23
	Greatest "advantages" of 75 percent turnover to states	23
		Correlation of "advantages" of funding takeover with region	25
	Greatest "weaknesses" of 75 percent turnover to states	25
		Correlation of "weaknesses" of funding takeover with region	27
	Federal control: distinct possibility or exaggerated fear?	28
	Preference for more or less federal participation in education	31
	In summary	33

Chapter	Page
EVALUATION OF PACE	35
FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS OF PACE	39
Correlation of "scope" and "simpler proposals"	41
Correlation of "region" with "continuation" and "simpler proposals"	42
RECOMMENDATIONS	44
APPENDICES	50
A. STATISTICAL PROCEDURES	51
B. SURVEY INSTRUMENT	61

List of Figures

Figure No.		Page
1	The Nine USOE Regions and Their Populations ...	3
2	Scope of Project	5
3	Area Served	6
4	Type of Activity.....	7
5	Classification of Project.....	8
6	Operational Budget.....	9
7	The "Average" Project	10
8	1968 Ranking on Problems of Project Operation ..	11
9	1966 Ranking on Problems of Project Operation ..	13
10	Correlation of Problems with Region.....	15
11	Ranking of Factors in Approving New Projects ...	16
12	Correlation Between Area Served and Needs of Area.....	16
13	Correlation Between Needs of Area and Region...	17
14	Rating of Criteria for Evaluating Project Effectiveness.....	19
15	Ranking of Criteria for Evaluating Overall Project Effectiveness.....	20
16	Correlation of "Constructive Change" Criterion with Scope of Project.....	21
17	Correlation of "Constructive Change" Criterion with Size of Budget.....	22
18	Advantages of Funding Turnover to States.....	23
19	Weaknesses of Funding Turnover to States	26
20	Correlation of Weaknesses of Funding Turnover with Region	28
21	Views on Fedneral Control: Distinct Possibility or Exaggerated Fear?	29
22	Preference for More or Less Federal Aid to Education.....	31
23	Evaluation by Project Directors, Judging "Self" and "PACE".....	35
24	PACE Develops Imaginative Solutions to Educational Problems.....	36
25	PACE Facilitates Demonstration of Worthwhile Innovations.....	36
26	PACE Assists in More Effective Knowledge Utilization	37

Figure No.		Page
27	PACE Contributes to Development of Supplementary Centers and Services	37
28	1968 Ratings on Needed Future PACE Developments	39
29	1966 Ratings on Needed Future PACE Developments	40
30	Correlation of "Scope" with "Simpler Proposals"	42
31	Correlation of "Region" with "Continuation" and "Simpler Proposals"	42
32	Contingency Table Analysis of "Early" and "Late" Responses	52
33	Correlation Between "Scope" and "Merits of Proposal"	55
34	Acceptance or Rejection of Hypothesis	57

INTRODUCTION

This fifth report of the Second National Study of ESEA Title III is an effort to learn what PACE project directors believe about problems, concerns, and needs related to the characteristics, operation, evaluation, and future of the ESEA Title III.

We are grateful for the generous cooperation on the part of project directors who took time to fill out the survey instrument in Appendix B, to Terry Ginn, research assistant, and to Charles J. Butcher, programmer, Fayette County Public Schools, who did the basic computer work.

Responsibility for analysis of the data rests with the director. Criticism or credit for interpretations, conclusions, should be his, as the effort was not a group activity of the study team. I would like, however, to express my appreciation to those who did react to the document—and thereby improve it.

This study is sponsored by an ESEA Title III grant to the Center for Effecting Educational Change, Fairfax County, Virginia, which subcontracted the assignment to the University of Kentucky's Research Foundation.

Richard I. Miller
Director of Study
November 20, 1968

BACKGROUND

This survey reporting views of 920 PACE project directors is the second such study. The first one was completed in conjunction with the first national study of ESEA Title III and the results are scattered throughout the report.[a/]

The purpose of this research is to provide an overall view of PACE, as seen by project directors. In doing so, the discussion will be concerned with characteristics of the existing projects; problems encountered; views toward state, local, and federal agencies; criteria for evaluation and funding; and ideas for the future. The study points out basic facts about the projects and basic relationships between different types of projects.

The survey instrument covers the six major areas:

A. Problems in project operation.
B. Relationships to local milieu.
C. Relationships to state departments.
D. Relationships to federal agencies.
E. Evaluation of PACE.
F. Future developments of PACE.

---

a/ Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate. Notes and Working Papers Concerning the Administration of Programs Authorized under Title III of Public Law 89-10... Washington, D. C.: The Government Printing Office, 1967, 557 pp.

Items in the questionnaire are divided into two groups—independent variables and dependent variables. The independent variables refer to fixed characteristics such as budget size, location, and so on. In this study there are six independent variables:

A. Scope of project.
B. Area served by project.
C. Type of activity.
D. Project classification.
E. Budget size.
F. Region.

The final independent variable—region—was not included in the questionnaire but was obtained from the postmark on the returned questionnaire.

Figure No. 1 identifies the nine regions used by the United States Office of Education (USOE).

Figure No. 1

The Nine USOE Regions and Their Populations

Region Number	Percentage of national population	States within region
1	6%	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
2	19	Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania
3	10	District of Columbia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Virgin Islands, Virginia, West Virginia

4	11	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee
5	20	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin
6	9	Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota
7	10	Arkansas, Canal Zone, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas
8	3	Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Wyoming
9	12	Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Trust Territories, Washington

The questionnaire included a number of items that are used as dependent variables. These are:

A. Four most difficult problems in project operation.
B. Primary factors suggested for state departments of education in deciding upon approval of new projects.
C. Primary factors in evaluating overall effectiveness of your PACE program.
D. Greatest advantage from 75 percent of turnover of ESEA funds to state departments of education.
E. Greatest weakness from this decision.
F. Whether federal control is a distinct possibility or an exaggerated and largely fictional fear.
G. More or less federal participation, based upon your experience with PACE.
H. Rating of your project in terms of four PACE objectives.
I. Rating of PACE in general in terms of these four objectives.
J. Suggestions for future development of ESEA Title III.

A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE STATISTICAL PROCEDURES USED IN THIS STUDY IS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX A.

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

Scope of project

The "scope" question sought to determine more precisely the geographical coverage of PACE projects, with the results given in Figure No. 2.

Figure No. 2

Scope of Project

Scope	Number Reporting	Percent of Total Sample
1. National	20	2%
2. Regional	25	3
3. One state	33	4
4. One district	191	23
4. Multi-district (2 - 6)	134	16
6. Multi-district (7)	307	36
7. Few schools within 1 district	81	10
8. One school	56	7

As one would expect, most of the projects fall within geographical patterns that are most appropriate for supplementary centers (multi-district, seven or more).

Area served

This question probed into the rural-urban distribution of projects, using eight descriptive categories, with the results given in Figure No. 3:

Figure No. 3

Area Served

Area	Number	Percent
Urban		
Central city	118	14%
Urban fringe	115	14
Other urban (suburban)		
Cities of 10,000 or more	251	30
Cities of 2,500 to 10,000	143	17
Rural		
Towns of 1,000 to 2,500	106	12
Rural	82	10
No answer	34	4

The classification of projects places these figures in the area of approximations rather than precise figures, but as approximations they may be considered representative of the whole population.

Approximately 27 percent would be classified as "urban" projects, and approximately 46 percent would be in "other urban" areas. Considering the fact that a very high percentage of the population lives on a very small percentage of the land, and that approximately 20 percent of the nation's population lives in the five metropolitan areas of New York City, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Detroit, the distribution of PACE projects does seem to have an "other urban" bias.

Type of activity

Information was sought on the types of activities undertaken by PACE projects, with the results given in Figure No. 4:

Figure No. 4

Type of Activity

Type of activity	Number	Percent
1. Mostly instruction or services directly to pupils, such as arts, sciences, social studies, mobile demonstrations, museum visits, ETV, outdoor camping, and guidance and counseling.	358	42%
2. Mostly services to teachers and principals; services such as instructional materials, audio-visual, demonstrations, and in-service training.	212	25
3. Mostly planning, such as surveying needs, designing new programs, and visiting innovations.	129	15
4. Mostly installation of one or two innovations in one or two schools—innovations such as ITA, computer-assisted instruction, teaching aides, parent involvement, job placement and new courses.	76	9
5. Mostly services to several local school districts, such as administration, dissemination, planning, and developing.	62	7
6. No response	12	1

A clear dominance of pupil-oriented projects is evident. While this dominance is not surprising, it does raise again the problem of evaluation. One can devise fairly rigorous evaluative schemes for single projects that focus on pupils if sufficient funds and qualified assistance are available for the task, but the evaluative procedures

become much more difficult when other activities are featured, such as planning and/or services to several local school districts.

Classification of project

This question sought information on the single idea or supplementary center emphasis, with the results given in Figure No. 5:

Figure No. 5

Classification of Project

	Classification	Number	Percent
1.	Focusing on a single idea or program	380	45%
2.	Serving as a supplementary center	455	54
3.	No response	14	20

The supplementary center concept has been growing steadily although it was an aspect of the program from the beginning. Early projects, however, tended to pursue the single idea or program rather than the center concept. But during the past year the center concept has grown more rapidly than the single idea project.

Operational budget

Respondents gave the operational figure for the 1968 fiscal year; then these amounts were placed in one of nine categories, with the results given in Figure No. 6:

Figure No. 6

Operational Budget

	Amount	Number	Percent
1.	0 - $25,000.00	66	8%
2.	$25,000.00 - $50,000.00	143	17
3.	$50,000.00 - $100,000.00	213	25
4.	$100,000.00 - $150,000.00	122	14
5.	$150,000.00 - $200,000.00	86	10
6.	$200,000.00 - $250,000.00	63	7
7.	$250,000.00 - $300,000.00	31	4
8.	$300,000.00 - $400,000.00	28	3
9.	$500,000.00 - up	35	4
	No response	62	7

One notes a clear preference for the $50,000.00 to $100,000.00 category. Compared to the first year, a definite trend is evident toward fewer and more expensive projects. The logic of this development probably resides in the belief that better things in education cost more money, that innovations are becoming more complex and therefore more expensive, and that quality is somehow equated with quantity.

The "average" project

What would an "average" project look like? As constructed from our data, 30 percent of the projects would fit this general picture: It is a multi-district project, with seven or more districts; it is serving a city of 10,000 or more; it provides services directly to pupils; it is serving as a supplementary center; and its budget is between $50,000.00 and $100,000.00.

The following percentage of projects fell into each of these five categories:

Figure No. 7

The "Average" Project

	Categories	Percent
1.	Working at the district level	74%
2.	In cities of 10,000 or more	30
3.	Services to pupils	42
4.	Serving as a supplementary center	54
5.	Budget between $50,000.00 and $100,000.00	25

PROJECT OPERATION

The following questions relate to how the project directors perceived their operations.

Four most difficult problems

The project directors were asked what had been the four most difficult problems encountered in their operation? They were given sixteen alternatives, and the following ratings resulted. Figure No. 8 lists the problems from the greatest frequency to the least:

Figure No. 8

1968 Ranking on Problems of Project Operation

Problem		Weighted Rating
1	Continuation after present funding is terminated	.092
2	Evaluation	- .012
3	Delay in funding and in approving modifications	- .053
4	Budget problems, such as unseen needs	- .103
5	Communication problems: keeping in touch with school system and others	- .105
6	Adequate time for orienting and training personnel	- .110
7	Adequate time for planning	- .148
8	Finding and holding qualified personnel	- .159
9	Administering the program: coordination of various programs and activities	- .208
10	Dissemination	- .232
11	Problems of space and facilities	- .240

12	Acceptance and cooperation on part of administrators, teachers, community, school boards	- .302
13	Delivery problems with equipment and materials	- .312
14	Red tape and paperwork to satisfy USOE	- .394
15	Red tape and paperwork to satisfy state department of education	- .521
16	Red tape and paperwork to satisfy local school system	- .547

Or to present the same findings in a somewhat different manner: the respondees were asked to list the most difficult problem, and a second most difficult one. The three most difficult problems, as recorded by 14 percent of the respondents, were:

A. Continuation after present funding is terminated;

B. Delay in funding and in approving modifications;

C. Finding and holding qualified personnel.

The respondees were asked to "place an '0' beside those descriptors that have caused no special problems or difficulties." Fifty-three percent had no special problems or difficulties with:

A. Acceptance and cooperation on part of administrators, teachers, community, school boards;

B. Local red tape;

C. State red tape;

D. USOE red tape.

And 18 percent had no special difficulties with "continuation after present funding is terminated."

It is interesting to compare the 1968 rating with that found on

the 1966 instrument. Results of the 1966 survey, answered by 720 project directors, are given in Figure No. 9:

Figure No. 9

1966 Ranking on Problems of Project Operations

Problem		Percentage Rating
1	Personnel problem: finding qualified personnel, etc.	21%
2	Equipment and materials delivered on time, etc.	19
3	Communications	15
4	No problems	13
5	Facilities: adequate space, location, etc.	11
6	Large area: transportation and coordination of schools	11
7	Accounting problems	9
8	Time for planning, in-service training, etc.	9
9	Other problems	7
10	Training personnel	7
11	Scheduling problems	6
12	Paperwork and red tape	4
13	Late arrival of funds	4
14	Cooperation of students	4
15	Cooperation of teachers	3
16	Evaluation problems	3

A comparison of Figure No. 8 (1968) and Figure No. 9 (1966) brings out some interesting differences. In the first place, "continuation after present funding is terminated" was not even mentioned in the 1966 survey, which was open-ended, while it is the number one concern in 1968. Secondly, evaluation has jumped from number 16 in 1966 to number two in 1968. This dramatically increased awareness augurs well for the future because awareness that you have a problem

is the first step in improvement. And to a lesser extent, the increased awareness of dissemination is a good sign. The extent to which project directors might have confused dissemination with communications is not known. Communications implies more of a two-way interaction and on a more regular basis, but communications should be considered as part of a dissemination system.

Correlation with type of project. The 16 problems listed for project operation were cross-classified with whether the project was a single idea or a supplementary center type. There was little significant difference between the problems of a single idea program as compared to a supplementary center.

The greatest differential between these two types of projects relates to the problem of "Evaluation." The single idea project accounts for 16 percent of the responses as compared to 10 percent for the supplementary type of project.

Correlation with region. A correlation of the single greatest problem with the nine regions gives this picture:

Figure No. 10

Correlation of Problems with Region

Single greatest problem	Percentage of response	Region number
Acceptance	26%	2
Administrating	25	5
Dissemination	23	2 and 8
Keeping on schedule	22	9
Continued funding	22	2
Commuication	22	5
Delay in funding	21	2
Budget problems	20	2
Finding personnel	20	5

Two findings are of particular interest:

(1) Region no. eight represents only 6.5 percent of the sample in this survey; yet, this region accounted for 22.7 percent of the total difficulty with "dissemination," and,

(2) region no. two is more outspoken about operational problems than any of the other regions.

Primary factors in approving new projects

The 1,400+ projects were asked which factors "should be given primary emphasis by the state department of education in deciding whether or not to approve new projects." The ratings on the four listed alternatives were calculated using a weighed procedure, with these results (Figure No. 11).

Figure No. 11

Ranking of Factors in Approving New Projects

Descriptor	Rating
Needs of the area: projects to fill definitely established gaps or needs in ongoing school programs	.574
Innovativeness and creativity as primary concerns	.573
Merits of proposal in terms of the deciding factor	.531
Geographical considerations: those areas without on-going PACE projects should have priority	- .484

The first three factors are all rated strongly. The strong negative rating on geographical considerations is the most prominent finding.

Correlation with area served. Taking the "needs of area" descriptor, which was rated most strongly just ahead of innovativeness and creativity, Figure No. 12 indicates the following correlation between it and area served:

Figure No. 12

Correlation Between Area Served and Needs of Area

Area served	Recommended most strongly	Recommended strongly	Not important
Central city	62%	33%	5%
Urban fringe	61	32	7
Cities of 10,000+	50	37	13
2,500 - 10,000	57	35	8
1,000 - 2,500	59	38	3
Other rural	70	22	8

Data contained in Figure No. 12 is not particularly revealing, unless the similarity of response can be taken as something of interest.

Directors with projects in cities of 10,000+ but not classified as part of the urban fringe, attached least importance to this criteria, although even the "least" rating still placed it as a strong factor.

Correlation with region. Again, using the needs of area criteria, this time it was correlated with region, and the results are evident in Figure No. 13:

Figure No. 13

Correlation Between Needs of Area and Region

Region number	Recommended most strongly	Recommended strongly	Not important
.1	56%	38%	6%
.2	65	26	10
.3	54	38	8
.4	60	36	5
.5	50	37	13
.6	58	35	7
.7	68	21	11
.8	38	53	9
.9	59	39	3

Figure No. 13 indicates that directors of projects from regions no. five and no. seven had the highest percentages of "not important" responses, and directors in region no. seven also had the highest percentages of "recommended most strongly" responses.

A regional analysis of the four factors gave the following results:

(a) "Geographical" - Regions no. two and no. five accounted for 17 and 19 percent, respectively, for "not important" total responses.

(b) "Innovativeness" - Regions no. two and no. five accounted for 17 and 19 percent, respectively, of "most strong" responses.

(c) "Merit" - Regions no. two and no. five accounted for 17 and 19 percent, respectively.

(d) "Needs" - Regions no. two and no. five accounted for 20 and 15 percent, respectively.

Regions no. two and no. five are the two largest regions, and, therefore, have more weight in determining the total responses. It should be noted that region no. five accounted for approximately 19 percent of the total listing of "innovativeness" and "merits," but only 15 percent toward "needs." Region no. nine accounted for a consistent 11 percent toward innovation, merits, and needs.

From the data gathered on this question, it is quite evident that PACE project directors have deep concerns about factors which will be emphasized by state departments of education. There is evident fear of "pork-barrel" allotments by geographical location. There is a strong desire to be recognized for innovativeness and creativity, for merits of proposal, and for needs of the area.

Criteria for evaluating project effectiveness

Project directors were asked to rate 12 factors with respect to a first, second, and third order of importance in evaluating the overall effectiveness of "your" project. Figure No. 14 shows the results in terms of a weighed computation so as to give the order of importance:

Figure No. 14

Rating of Criteria for Evaluating Project Effectiveness

Criteria	Most important	Second most important	Third most important	Not important	No responses
Constructive change (improvement) in local education	264	154	97	25	309
Demonstration of program	60	68	67	123	531
Development of functional student skills	59	79	46	102	563
Development of interest, acceptance and involvement	113	165	107	48	416
Dissemination	15	61	56	102	614
Innovative and creative (development of new ideas and approaches)	167	141	110	42	397
Local or extramural funding for continuation of project after PACE funds expire	32	58	55	139	565
Meeting area needs	127	101	91	65	465
Meeting objectives set forth in proposal	243	102	88	52	363
Planning and evaluation service to local school districts	22	49	43	126	608
Producing desirable results	94	95	102	58	500
Serving a sizeable number of pupils	24	40	54	281	447

(1) (2) (3)

*/ The "no response" category evidently represents those that did not feel that the criterion was one of the three most important, yet they did not believe it was "not important."

If a weighed rating is given to the 12 factors, the following ranking becomes evident (Figure No. 15):

Figure No. 15

Ranking of Criteria for Evaluating Overall Project Effectiveness

Criteria		Rating
1.	Constructive change	.403
2.	Meeting objectives	.333
3.	Innovative and creative	.290
4.	Development of interest	.244
5.	Meeting area needs	.184
6.	Producing results	.152
7.	Development of skills	.028
8.	Demonstration	.006
9.	Dissemination	- .035
10.	Local funding	- .060
11.	Planning and evaluation	- .071
12.	Serving a sizeable number	- .249

Answers to this question may be somewhat subject to doubt due to the vagueness of some categories. The criterion of "constructive change (improvement) in local education" is a general category that is very difficult to evaluate.

On the other hand, it is interesting to note that the second ranked criterion of "meeting objectives set forth in proposal" is perhaps one of the most precise of the 12 criteria, and it is encouraging to note that project directors are willing to have their work evaluated on the extent to which it is moving toward established objectives.

Correlation of "constructive change" with scope of project.

Figure No. 16 indicates how the category of "constructive change" correlates with the scope of the project:

Figure No. 16

Correlation of "Constructive Change" Criterion with Scope of Project

Scope	Most important	Second most important	Third most important	Not important
National	25.0%	25.0%	33.3%	16.7%
Regional	47.1	29.4	17.6	5.9
One state	18.8	37.5	43.8	0.0
Seven or more districts	48.2	30.7	15.1	6.0
Two to six districts	43.9	25.6	24.4	6.1
One district	58.0	26.0	13.7	2.3
A few schools	52.1	20.8	27.1	0.0
One school	48.6	40.0	5.7	5.7

Projects operating on a national scale evidently attach less importance to constructive change than do the others. This finding probably results from nationally oriented projects having less contact with or responsibility for local education. None of the directors of projects operating on the state level believed this criterion was unimportant, but only 18.8 percent thought it was most important.

Correlation of "constructive change" with size of budget. Figure No. 17 indicates how constructive change correlates with size of budget:

Figure No. 17

Correlation of "Constructive Change" Criterion with Size of Budget

Budget size in 1000's of dollars	Most important	Second most important	Third most important	Not important
0 - 25	43.5%	27.3%	20.5%	6.8%
25 - 50	61.2	20.4	14.3	4.1
50 - 100	47.7	29.5	17.4	5.3
100 - 150	41.7	26.4	29.2	2.8
150 - 200	61.4	22.8	14.0	1.8
200 - 250	45.9	29.7	21.6	2.7
250 - 300	22.7	63.6	9.1	4.5
300 - 400	42.1	26.3	15.8	15.8
400 - up	33.3	33.3	25.0	8.3

An analysis of these figures indicates that projects with larger budgets seem to attach less importance to "constructive change in local education."

STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONSHIPS

The following four questions probe into the delicate matter of state-federal relationships. The four questions are, in essence: What are the "greatest advantages" likely to accrue from the 75 percent turnover of funds to the states; what likely will be the "greatest weakness" from this decision; is federal control "a distinct possibility or an exaggerated and largely fictional fear;" and "based upon your experience, do you favor more or less federal participation in education?"

Greatest "advantages" of 75 percent turnover to states

Since the question was open-ended, it was necessary to develop categories that fitted the responses. This categorization was based upon a sampling of the first 150 returns.

Figure No. 18

Advantages of Funding Turnover to States

Advantage		Number in category	Percentage of total*/
1.	Direct lines of communication	405	51%
2.	Better knowledge of local problems	193	24
3.	No advantage	124	16
4.	More economical use of funds	76	9

*/ Fifty-one no responses are not included in these figures.

To provide a flavor of participant reactions, some verbatim comments are included here. These views are all favorable to the state takeover:

- Facilitation of funding schedule with a minimum of complications, and communication with "nearby" authority.
- Increased ability to "fit" funding to local priority needs.
- Local contacts in a smaller region, more opportunity to observe program.
- A source of information about other projects in the state as well as ready guidance at the local level.
- Expedite funding in terms of significant school calendar dates.
- Ability to improve weaknesses in specific areas where needs are greatest.
- Hopefully, this may help to eliminate negotiation and budgetary delays.
- Hopefully, greater flexibility in budget revision—a reflection of more local needs, concerns, motivation.
- Should provide State Departments of Education with needed funds to stimulate statewide innovation.
- We should have less direction from people who know little about education.
- Statewide planning.
- Proximity—easier to change areas of project as needs arise.

- Reduction of programs which do not meet local and statewide educational needs.

- State control will enable us to seek advise, guidance, and help on a more personal basis.

- The state is more likely to know needs of school systems; perhaps money will be disseminated more evenly throughout state rather than being concentrated in one or two districts.

- If properly managed, it can be directed to those projects doing the most for education. Study grants accomplish nothing. Projects should be actively doing something for our students. This can be done if the administrators will keep careful controls over the projects.

- A planned overall comprehensive program.

- Problems peculiar to the state may be more adequately met.

- More flexibility.

Correlation of "advantages" of funding takeover with region.

The only significant relationship by region was found in region no. three which gave a 24.2 percent rating to the "no advantage" category. Thirteen and two-tenth's percent of the total "no advantage" category came from the next-to-the smallest region.

Greatest "weaknesses" of 75 percent turnover to states

Figure No. 19 indicates the findings:

Figure No. 19

Weaknesses of Funding Turnover to States

Weakness		Number in category	Percentage of total*/
1.	Politics	458	61%
2.	Lack of leadership	117	15
3.	Lower standards	93	12
4.	No weakness	33	4
5.	Additional administrative costs	32	4
6.	Loss in funding	23	3

*/ The 93 no responses are not included in these figures.

The following sample of verbatim comments focuses upon alleged weaknesses and disadvantages from the turnover:

- Narrowness.
- Added administrative costs.
- The closer to home, the less innovative it is likely to be. Local or state just might not think big enough—more subject to pressures.
- It will probably result in assignment of funds to the areas now spending the least amount of money rather than to the areas coming up with innovative programs.
- Funds might be used to meet routine needs instead of improving teaching and learning efficiency.
- Loss of competitive factor on a national basis—leadership in state has not been "innovative" or "creative."
- Lack of national coordination in diffusion of information and change of overlapping in various state programs.

- Keeping money for state needs and not encouraging ways to develop programs. Restrictions reduce initiative.

- Grant awards on basis of geographical allotments, rather than on basis of innovative ideas.

- Less involvement with other states, educators, etc.

- Too great concern for limited rural problems. Increased difficulty gaining recognition for large urban problems.

- Lack of courage on the part of state agencies in backing projects that can influence change, and, instead, attempt to please all.

- Loss of direct support from Washington. Loss of money to grass roots of regions. Less objective.

- This may cause a reduction in congressional funding because of decreased federal control.

- State department is currently a weak and inept organization due to a lack of quantity and quality of personnel.

- A proneness to favoritism or personal "pull." Failure to reach beyond state educational level.

Correlation of "weaknesses" of funding turnover with region.

Figure No. 20 provides this correlation:

Figure No. 20

Correlation of Weaknesses of Funding Turnover with Region

Region	Politics	Lack of leadership	Lower standards	No weakness	Additional adm. costs	Loss in funding
1	61%	22%	8%	2%	2%	6%
2	57	12	14	3	6	7
3	63	15	6	6	6	3
4	56	10	27	2	5	2
5	68	17	5	4	5	1
6	58	26	9	1	4	3
7	54	12	22	9	2	2
8	58	19	13	4	6	0
9	65	11	12	7	5	1

The overwhelming percentage responses to "politics" as the greatest weakness is the dominant feature.

Four other noteworthy relationships are:

(1) "Politics" as the greatest weakness was supported by all regions at a 55 percent plus level.

(2) Twenty-one and nine-tenths percent of region no. one and 25.9 percent of region no. six listed "lack of leadership" as disadvantage, and together accounted for three percent of the total response in this category.

(3) Twenty-seven percent of region no. four and 22 percent of region no. seven listed "lower standards" as disadvantage, and together accounted for 37 percent of the total response in this category.

(4) Forty-three percent of the total response to "change in funding" was listed by region no. two.

Federal control: distinct possibility or exaggerated fear?

The project directors responded to this question: "PACE has been essentially a federal-to-local program. From what you have

learned from your dealings with Washington, is federal control a distinct possibility or an exaggerated and largely fictional fear?" The results are given in Figure No. 21:

Figure No. 21

Views on Federal Control: Distinct Possibility or Exaggerated Fear

Federal control	Percentage of responses
1. Exaggerated and largely fictional fear	78%
2. A distinct possibility	22

This question allowed the participants to use their own words to evaluate their experience with Washington. A sample of their verbatim comments is included here:

- Federal control is a possibility. Only projects that follow the "philosophy of Washington" are funded.
- In my experience, the federally imposed controls have neither been detrimental to education of children nor have they been in any way offensive.
- Largely exaggerated—the only controls I have found are those we wrote into the proposals.
- The federal control I have experienced has been sensible and necessary.
- Our relationships to this point have been satisfactory.
- It is a dangerous and distinct trend of subtle federal control.
- Federal control is inevitable if the local and state educators do not accomplish stated goals.

- "Control" is a loaded word, but there is no doubt that direction and emphasis can be controlled by Washington—with unfortunate results.

- A fictional fear but strongly felt by citizens—they simply fear the unknown and any substantive alteration in the status quo.

- Definitely a fictional fear as long as guidelines are in keeping with legislation. Congress responds rather rapidly to local and grass roots appeal.

- I believe federal control fears have been greatly exaggerated. In actuality, the conflict which has arisen occasionally from differences of opinion between the state and federal offices has led to healthy discourse.

- At this point it appears to be an exaggerated fear. Guidelines not controls have been in effect.

- Federal authorities give us greater leeway than programs controlled by the state.

- Although federal control has been quite minimal to date, the dependence of schools on federal funds places them in a very vulnerable position. Once a program is in operation it is very difficult to discontinue, and if the federal government controls the funds the school has placed itself at the government's mercy.

- Federal control is a myth—absolutely unfounded. If anything, federal funds have unlocked and freed local educators so that they could have an opportunity to innovate.

- Mixed emotions—I'm not as concerned about the USOE as about Congress.

- The control does not come on an approved project. The control comes before approval when you have to fit your ideas to the "guide lines."

- Exaggerated fear.
  PACE is a healthy, outside force.
  PACE requires accountability from those participating.

Correlations by region did not reveal any noteworthy differences.

Preference for more or less federal participation in education

Project directors were asked this question: "Do you favor more or less federal participation in education based upon your experience with PACE?" Figure No. 22 indicates their responses:

Figure No. 22

Preference for More or Less Federal Aid to Education

Degree of participation	Percentage of responses
1. More	90%
2. Less	10

A sample of verbatim reactions follows:

- Less federal participation, because of the tendency to go "whole hog" because it is federal money. Local tax payers would not stand for having their money spent in the same ways in which PACE money has been spent.

- Let's put it this way: Federal participation makes it difficult for the local educational agency to circumvent the wishes of Congress. Congress appropriated the money for a specific purpose and some administrators and school boards would like to use this money for general aid.

- I fear more federal control of general education, but I will graciously accept more controls if it keeps the L. E. A. honest.

- More federal participation, especially in the areas of consultation, planning and funding.

- More. In culturally and economically deprived areas in the South, federal aid has been a shot in the arm.

- I am in favor of more federal participation because local funds are not available for some worthwhile projects that otherwise would be forgotten.

- I favor more federal participation and leadership. This does not necessarily mean control, but rather stimulation.

- The balance seems to have been appropriate in the past two years. Federal criteria have not seemed excessive.

- More, if we are to overcome the "cultural lag" that exists today.

- I am afraid my biases would be greatly in favor of more federal participation if we ever hope to remove some of the inequalities which exist in relation to educational opportunities available to children throughout the United States.

- I would suggest more federal participation in the area of innovations in education through exploratory, trial and "seed" programs as a vehicle to stimulate fresh approaches to education.

- Less. If local programs are worthwhile, local support should be encouraged more.

- If the state becomes more involved with Title III and is successful in its efforts, less federal participation would be necessary.

- The participation is about right—no more and no less.

- More federal participation, if that participation can maintain or increase present flexibility. More

> participation particularly in areas such as Title III (innovative), as state and local funds too often used for necessity—not for experiment. Federal funds should prime the pump.

In Summary

Any analysis of data in this section should be made with several points in mind. In the first place, the answers reflect adequate time for judging the federal-local relationships but an inadequate period for judging the state-local relationships in their present context. Secondly, the data represent the anonymous opinion PACE project directors mailed directly to the Lexington facility. We have every reason to believe that we were able to obtain a valid feedback. And thirdly, answers on federal-state-local relationships likely will reflect a point of view on the broader issue of these relationships rather than being confined to ESEA Title III.

From our analysis, it would appear that the project directors have given an insightful and helpful picture of the strengths and weaknesses of state department control.

The extent of the positive support for the federal-local relationships is stronger than expected, and it is quite possible that our findings would have indicated an even stronger support for federal aid if the 75 percent turnover to the states had not been enacted. Some unknown percentage of project directors undoubtedly took the view that state control was not a fait accompli, and, therefore, it would

be desirable to look harder for state strengths and for federal weaknesses than would have been the case if the PACE program had remained essentially a federal-local relationship.

The strong positive support for the federal-local relationship also is a tribute to the effort of a small and dedicated USOE Title III staff. Those most prone to criticize the federal management of the PACE operation usually have had little experience with and knowledge about the federal staff, so they tend to talk in broad generalities about the Washington "bureaucrats;" they tend to confuse policy information with program operation; and their expectations for federal perfection are more demanding than that held for the state and local levels. Of course, one can find legitimate and important criticism of the USOE Title III operation, and some of these will be aired in the final report; but the usual line of criticism, by those with little real experience and knowledge of the Washington scene, often is neither constructive nor insightful.

EVALUATION OF PACE

All respondents were asked to use a percentage of success figure ("0" to "100") to rate (a) their own projects, and (b) PACE in general—on the following four objectives, which are the official ones found in the USOE guidelines.

1. Does PACE encourage school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems?

2. Does PACE facilitate demonstration of worthwhile innovations in educational practice through exemplary programs?

3. Does PACE assist school programs in more effective utilization of latest knowledge about learning and teaching?

4. Has it contributed to the creation, design, and intelligent use of supplementary centers and services?

A comparison of the two estimates is contained in Figure No. 23:

Figure No. 23

Evaluation by Project Directors, Judging "Self" and "PACE"

Criteria	Percentage of success: Own project	PACE in general
1. Imaginative solutions	75%	74%
2. Demonstration	77	71
3. Knowledge utilization	67	65
4. Use of supplementary centers	76	76

From Figure No. 23 it is obvious that PACE project directors believe that their own program is doing a good job in meeting the general objectives of the overall program. "Good," of course, is open to interpretation: Does one consider an alleged 75 percent to be "good"? And project directors are only slightly less positive in their views of PACE as a whole.

This same question was asked of two other groups: (1) state coordinators of ESEA Title III, and (2) the 20 special consultants working on the second national evaluation study of PACE, with these results:

Figure No. 24

PACE Develops Imaginative Solutions to Educational Problems

Group	Percentage of effectiveness			
	100 - 75%	74 - 55%	54 - 25%	24 - 0%
PACE directors	72	9	16	4
State coordinators	67	26	0	8
Special consultants	22	11	67	11

Figure No. 25

PACE Facilitates Demonstration of Worthwhile Innovations

Group	Percentage of effectiveness			
	100 - 75%	74 - 55%	54 - 25%	24 - 0%
PACE directors	66	12	18	4
State coordinators	70	26	4	0
Special consultants	11	11	56	22

Figure No. 26

PACE Assists in More Effective Knowledge Utilization

Group	Percentage of effectiveness 100 - 75%	74 - 55%	54 - 25%	24 - 0%
PACE directors	53	12	26	8
State coordinators	64	16	12	8
Special consultants	0	11	67	22

Figure No. 27

PACE Contributes to Development of Supplementary Centers and Services

Group	Percentage of effectiveness 100 - 75%	74 - 55%	54 - 25%	24 - 0%
PACE directors	57	14	21	8
State coordinators	46	38	15	0
Special consultants	22	44	11	22

Estimates of effectiveness are dramatically different for the special consultants as compared with the project directors and the state PACE coordinators. And between the latter two groups, project directors consistently give higher estimates of effectiveness.

Who is right? Such contrasts in judgment between the experts and the practitioners are puzzling because the experts did approach their assignment with a sympathetic and practical vent, and many project directors are able to maintain some detachment and objectivity toward their work. Perhaps some of the differences may reside in the traditional role of criticism that remains an important dimension of the university perspective, and some differences are due to different

expectations, with the university-oriented special consultants having greater concern for perfection.

Striking differences in perceptions among PACE project directors, state coordinators, and the special consultants should be considered by state advisory councils and others who pull together evaluation teams. From evidence presented here, one could predict with some confidence that the final evaluation would reflect significantly the composition of the group.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS OF PACE

A final question to project directors asked about "what ideas and suggestions would you offer for future developments of Title III? Six alternatives were given; the categories were based upon what was found through a similar, but open-ended, question that was asked in the 1966 survey.

By using a weighting procedure, it is possible to rank responses from greatest to least important, with the results given in Figure No. 28:

Figure No. 28

1968 Ratings on Needed Future PACE Developments

Category		Rating
1.	Allot more funds to PACE	.600
2.	Continuation of project funding beyond three years	.542
3.	More flexibility within the budget	.288
4.	Clearer and simpler guidlines and proposal forms	.191
5.	Closer relationship of PACE projects with other ESEA Titles and other grant programs	.164
6.	Construction funds made available	.013

From Figure No. 28 it is obvious that project directors consider the categories of "more funds" and "continuation beyond three years" as the significant needs for the future, and that the directors are not concerned about construction funds, per se. Responses to

these two categories remain very similar for all possible correlations using any of the six independent variables. The other three categories used in determining future needs had some support but were far less popular than "funds" and "continuation" concerns.

Figure No. 29 gives the ratings found on the survey of 723 project directors made in the fall of 1966:

Figure No. 29

1966 Ratings on Needed Future PACE Developments

Category		Percent responses
1.	Allot more funds to PACE	10%
2.	Dissemination of results: use of ERIC, regional labs, and a PACE newsletter	9
3.	Construction funds made available	7
4.	More consultant help and field representation from USOE	6
5.	Simpler and clearer guidelines and proposal forms	5
6.	Earlier receipt of funds and notification	5
7.	Funding emphasis on:	
	a. Merit only	3
	b. Innovations for area	5
	c. Less emphasis on innovation	1
	d. Local needs and practicality	3
	e. Exemplary	2
	f. Avoid duplication: few of quality	3
	g. Careful planning and clear objectives	1
	h. Regional approach	2
8.	More direction from the State	4
9.	And several other categories	

From a comparison of the 1966 and 1968 surveys, one notes that "more funds" is the greatest need in both. Dissemination, the number two "need" in 1966 was not included in the 1968 survey—due

to our oversight. As one would expect, the concern for "continuation" was not evident during the first year of the program.

It is interesting to note that the need for "more flexibility within the budget" and for "clearer and simpler guidlines and proposal forms" increased significantly from 1966 to 1968, perhaps in keeping with an observation credited to John W. Gardner: "Great ventures start with a vision and end with a power structure."

Each year something is added to the guidelines and proposal forms but nothing is ever taken out. The results not only look like a camel, , but a much larger camel. Accountability measures do require a careful set of guidelines; but the nature of PACE has changed considerably since its inceptionand, therefore, these changes need to be reflected in guidelines and proposal forms.

Correlation of "scope" and "simpler proposals"

Figure No. 30 indicates how the "scope" of the project correlates with "clearer and simpler guidelines and proposal forms."

Figure No. 30

Correlation of "Scope" with "Simpler" Proposals

Scope	Recommended most strongly	Recommended strongly	Not important
National	57%	14%	29%
Regional	8	15	77
One state	33	33	33
Seven or more districts	34	37	30
Six to two districts	30	42	28
One district	40	39	21
A few schools	36	41	23
One school	43	25	32

The striking departure from a fairly uniform distribution is the eight percent rating on "recommended most strongly" and the 77 percent rating on "not important" by those reporting from the regional perspective.

Correlation of "region" with "continuation" and "simpler proposals"

Figure No. 31 indicates how the nine USOE regions correlate with continuation and simpler proposals.

Figure No. 31

Correlation of "Region" with "Continuation" and "Simpler Proposals"

	Recommended most strongly		Recommended strongly		Not important	
Region	Continuation	Simpler proposals	C	SP	C	SP
1	54%	38%	32%	44%	14%	18%
2	62	44	32	31	7	25
3	67	45	29	34	3	21
4	68	36	29	39	3	26
5	50	31	31	33	19	36
6	62	15	27	34	12	51
7	67	37	32	40	2	23
8	70	36	19	41	11	24
9	59	40	21	35	20	25

From Figure No. 31 it is evident that region no. six attaches much less importance to "simpler proposals" than the others. One notes also the overall agreement upon the "continuation" category, although there is a significant variation from the 70 percent in the "most strongly recommended" category for region no. eight to a 50 percent rating for region no. five.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of recommendations seem to flow from an analysis of data contained in this volume.

1. MEETING OBJECTIVES, NEEDS OF THE AREA, INNOVATIVENESS AND CREATIVITY AND MERITS OF THE PROPOSAL SHOULD BE GIVEN PRIMARY EMPHASIS IN DEVELOPING AND EVALUATING PACE PROJECTS.

PACE stands for Projects to Advance Creativity in Education. This obvious point is easy to forget when a project director indicates that his project is:

serving a sizeable number,
providing a good public relations,
producing results,
assisting the regular school program,
and so forth.

These descriptors are legitimate and may be important, but they are not the focus of PACE. It is very important that the innovative and creative edge of PACE be carefully guarded. American education is in constant and considerable need of cutting edge, diverse approaches to common and uncommon problems.

2. STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS SHOULD BECOME POWERFUL INSTRUMENTS, THEMSELVES ERRING ON THE SIDE OF CREATIVITY AND DYNAMISM RATHER THAN PASSIVITY AND APPROVAL.

This volume has not dealt with state advisory councils but it has been concerned with the primary thrusts of the PACE project; and since state advisory councils—a new mechanism—are importantly situated with respect to these thrusts, it would seem appropriate to bring in the state advisory councils at this point.

At this early juncture it is impossible to judge the quality of the state advisory councils; but as Terrel H. Bell, Utah State Superintendent of Public Instruction, points out: "It seems to me that advisory councils will be what we make of them. Title III advisory councils will function on a high level if we appoint capable people, provide adequate and effective staff support, and place considerable weight upon the advice the council offers."[a/]

3. STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS MUST TAKE EVERY CAUTION AGAINST UNDESIRABLE POLITICAL INTERESTS, WHICH CAN INCLUDE GEOGRAPHICAL CONSIDERATION AND PATRONAGE.

[a/] Terrel H. Bell, "The State Advisory Council," Conference on Innovation. (Report by the President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, November, 1968), p. 44.

The problem of excessive political interests in some states may be an albatross for organized innovation. At this early stage, one can cite a few instances where the dynamic and exciting edge of PACE has been compromised by political interests. While politics is a vital part of our way of life, our children and youth are the losers when selfish political interests of a few take precedence over educational interests of the many.

Perhaps an open awareness of the dangers of excessive political considerations is the best safeguard against it, along with carefully designed procedures for project development, evaluation, and dissemination.

As more political and educational power shifts from the federal and the local levels to the state level—a trend that is now several years old and likely to continue for many more years—many observers believe that new approaches and programs will be required at the state level if the challenges of new opportunities are to be met. In his January, 1967, Inaugural Address, Washington's Governor Daniel Evans said: "State governments are unquestionably on trial today. If we are not willing to pay the price, if we cannot change where change is required, then we have only one recourse. And that

is to prepare for an orderly transfer of our remaining responsibilities to the federal government."[a/]

4. WAYS OF CONTINUING SOME PACE PROJECTS BEYOND THREE YEARS SHOULD BE FOUND.

Sound investment of public monies for education requires that some, probably few, PACE projects should be continued beyond three years, but probably not more than five years in any case. We know now that three years is altogether too short a period of time for some projects and an excellent time span for many others—probably a majority of them.

Many potential problems loom ahead if the three year grant period is lengthened or made open-ended for all projects. It can mean that fewer new projects can be started; that the state will be saddled for more than three years with average or less-than-average projects; and that the tempo of individual projects may become less dynamic.

At this time, it would seem unwise to have a general extension beyond the three years, but it seems equally unwise to not have some sort of status that will allow an extension (a) for the exceptional project and (b) for the exceptional project that requires a longer development period.

[a/] Quoted in Committee for Economic Development, Modernizing State Government. New York: The Committee, 1967, p. 10.

5. SUBSTANTIALLY GREATER FUNDS SHOULD BE APPROPRIATED FOR ESEA TITLE III.

Evidence obtained on the 1966 and 1968 surveys indicates very clearly that project directors, those who should know, need more funds.

The turnover to the states may be a hopeful sign for increased funds. Heretofore, the PACE program had no organized constituency; now it has 50 powerful ones, and perhaps some organizational support also. An organized effort to increase the appropriate funding level is certainly in order. While the program is far from perfect, it is serving well the cutting edge dimension of American education. In other words, the increase in PACE funds is a good investment of public money.

In the second of these six reports (in March, 1968), the national study team made the following general appraisal of PACE:

> "In the course of its work, this study team has examined several hundred Title III proposals and inspected close to 200 projects in the field. Taken as a whole, considering the 2,500 projects that have been funded over a period of two years, we believe that PACE is serving in many communities across the nation as a dynamic and positive force for educational improvement."

"The study team feels that education has much at stake in the continuation of Title III's spirit of venture capital—the first 'thinking money' many school districts ever had—and in the success of the states in building upon this thrust. Otherwise, if Title III should someday lose or forget its first premise and early promise, it is predictable that of necessity there will be elsewhere emerge another fund, quite possibly from those agencies dealing with the agony of cities, to recover and resume the unique quest that was Title III's. The nation has a right to expect that education will lead in its own renewal. Title III is the sharpest tool to that end. If the cutting edge is dulled, another instrument will be fashioned—and probably not by education."

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

When applying statistical procedures to a sample of a population, one must consider whether or not the sample is a valid representation of the total population. In our case, the sample consists of the 849 returns from the mailing of the questionnaires. This is 60.6 percent of the whole population, of 1,400 PACE project directors. The underlying idea regarding validity of the sample may be stated as follows: Is it probable that views of the 39.4 percent of the project directors not considered in the present sample differ sufficiently to invalidate conclusions about the overall PACE program? Of course, the fact that the present sample represents well over one-half of the entire population favors validity, but this rule-of-thumb judgment is not good enough.

April 22, 1968, was set as the cut-off date and questionnaires received after this date were kept but not included in the working sample. In an attempt to learn more about our working sample, the responses to the 71 questionnaires received after April 22 were compared to a random sample of equal size from the working sample of 849 returns. This was done by the method of contingency table

analysis. Hence, we tested the hypothesis that the percentage of responses to various questions remained the same regardless of whether or not the response was classified as being "early" or "late." Figure No. 32 indicates the results of this test:

Figure No. 32

Contingency Table Analysis of "Early" and "Late" Responses

	Question	Accept hypothesis
1.0	Scope of Project	Yes
1.1	Area Served	Yes
1.2	Type of Activity	Yes
1.3	Classification	Yes
1.4	Budget	Yes
2.00	Acceptance	Yes
2.01	Time for Planning	Yes
2.02	Training Personnel	Yes
2.03	Administering Program	Yes
2.04	Budget Problems	Yes
2.05	Communication Problems	Yes
2.06	Continuation	Yes
2.07	Delay in Funding	No
2.08	Delivery Problems	Yes
2.09	Dissemination	Yes
2.10	Evaluation	Yes
2.11	Qualified Personnel	Yes
2.12	Keeping on Schedule	Yes
2.13	Space Problems	Yes
2.14	Local Red Tape	Yes
2.15	State Red Tape	Yes
2.16	USOE Red Tape	Yes
3.00	Geographical	Yes
3.01	Innovativeness	Yes
3.02	Merits of Proposal	Yes
3.03	Needs of Area	Yes
3.10	Constructive Change	Yes
3.11	Demonstration	Yes
3.12	Development Skills	Yes

3.13	Development Interest	Yes
3.14	Dissemination	Yes
3.15	Innovativeness	Yes
3.16	Local Funding	Yes
3.17	Meeting Needs	Yes
3.18	Meeting Objectives	Yes
3.19	Planning	Yes
3.20	Producing	Yes
3.21	Sizeable Number	Yes
4.0	State Dept. Advantages	Yes
4.1	State Dept. Weaknesses	Yes
4.2	Federal Control	Yes
4.3	Federal Participation	Yes
5.00	Project Success No. 1	Yes
5.01	Project Success No. 2	Yes
5.02	Project Success No. 3	Yes
5.03	Project Success No. 4	Yes
5.10	PACE Success No. 1	Yes
5.11	PACE Success No. 2	Yes
5.12	PACE Success No. 3	Yes
5.13	PACE Success No. 4	Yes
5.20	Allot More Funds	Yes
5.21	Simpler Proposals	Yes
5.22	Closer PACE-ESEA	Yes
5.23	Construction Funds	Yes
5.24	Continuation 4 years	Yes
5.25	Budget Flexibility	Yes
	Region	Yes

In only one case out of 57 was a significant difference found between the "early" and "late" responses, and that was on question no. 2.07, "Delay in Funding." The percentage responses to this question were as follows:

	Most difficult	Second most difficult	Third most difficult	Fourth most difficult	No difficulty
Early	31.9%	6.4%	2.1%	8.5%	51.1%
Late	11.1	22.2	8.9	11.1	46.7

Persons classified as "early" seemed to consider "Delay in Funding" a greater problem than those responses received "late." Might one hypothesize that those late in returning the questionnaire might be less compulsive about delays, and hence they may be different from the earlier returnees;

We can say, with the one exception noted above, that in all probability there is little difference between our working sample and the unsampled portion of the population. Also, save for the one exception, the working sample may be considered to be a sample of 920, or 65.7 percent of the entire population, rather than 849, or 60.6 percent of the entire population.

Pertinent relationships were sought between the six independent and all the dependent variables. For example, if one wanted to determine whether the responses to item 4.3,"Do you favor more or less federal participation?", are independent of the responses to item 1.0, "What is the scope of your project?", it is necessary to learn whether the percentages of responses to 4.3 change as one considers, in turn, each of the eight categories in variable 1.0. Then, in order to answer questions similar to those presented previously, the following hypothesis is tested for pairs of appropriate variables.

Hypothesis: The percentage of responses to a given dependent variable remains the same for all possible classifications of a given independent variable.

For further explanation, consider the following case: Assume that it is desired to know if projects directed toward the national level differ from those working on a local level in their opinions as to whether or not "Merits of Proposal" is an important criterion. In this case the independent variable is "Scope of Project," and the dependent variable is "Merits of Proposal." Figure No. 33 gives the percentages of responses for these two questions:

Figure No. 33

Correlation Between "Scope" and "Merits of Proposal"

Scope	Recommended most strongly	Recommended strongly	Not important
National	56%	44%	0%
Regional	50	50	0
One State	50	46	4
Seven or more districts	46	49	5
Six to two districts	41	52	2
One district	54	39	7
A few schools	50	43	7
One school	43	49	8

From Figure No. 33 one finds that 56 percent of the directors of projects focusing on the national scene recommend the criterion "Merits of Proposal" most strongly. (Our hypothesis means that we are assuming that the percentages in each column are equal.) If we accept the hypothesis, then we can answer "no" to the question:

"Are there any significant differences between (or among) the responses of the various groups in question 1.0 as in reference to question 3.02?" And if we reject the hypothesis, the answer is "yes." In this particular case, the hypothesis is accepted ("yes"); there are no statistically significant differences between the eight categories of 1.0 and their respective responses to 4.3.

The preceding procedure was carried out for all six independent questions and 51 dependent questions. In each case, the stated hypothesis was tested.

The method adopted to test this hypothesis is called contingency table analysis. The "Nucros" computer program was used to develop the desired contingency tables. The contingency table analysis is the means by which statistical validity of the results will be claimed.

A five percent level of confidence was used. In all, 306 contingency tables were developed in order to test the hypothesis for each case. Figure No. 34 gives the results of these computations:

Figure No. 34

Acceptance or Rejection of Hypothesis

Dependent variables		Independent variables					
		Scope	Area served	Type activity	Classi-fication	Budget	Region
2.00	Acceptance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.01	Time for Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.02	Training	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.03	Administering	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.04	Budget Prob-lems	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.05	Communica-tion	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
2.06	Continuation	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
2.07	Funding Delay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.08	Delivery Prob-lems	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.09	Dissemination	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
2.10	Evaluation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.11	Qualified Per-sonnel	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
2.12	Schedule	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.13	Space Prob-lems	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.14	Local Red Tape	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Dependent variables		Independent variables					
		Scope	Area served	Type activity	Classi-fication	Budget	Region
2.15	State Red Tape	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.16	USOE Red Tape	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.00	Geographical	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
3.01	Innovativeness	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.02	Merits	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
3.03	Needs of Area	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
3.10	Constructive Change	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
3.11	Demonstra-tion	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
3.12	Development Skills	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
3.13	Development Interest	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.14	Dissemination	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.15	Innovativeness	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.16	Local Funds	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.17	Meeting Needs	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
3.18	Meeting Objec-tives	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
3.19	Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.20	Producing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Dependent variables		Independent variables					
		Scope	Area served	Type activity	Classification	Budget	Region
3.21	Sizeable No.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4.0	St. Dept. Advantages	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
4.1	St. Dept. Weaknesses	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
4.2	Federal Control	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4.3	Federal Participation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5.00	Project Success No. 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
5.01	Project Success No. 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5.02	Project Success No. 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5.03	Project Success No. 4	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
5.10	PACE Success No. 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5.11	PACE Success No. 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5.12	PACE Success No. 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5.13	PACE Success No. 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
5.20	More Funds	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Dependent variables	Independent variables					
	Scope	Area served	Type activity	Classification	Budget	Region
5.21 Simpler Proposals	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
5.22 Closer PACE-ESEA	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
5.23 Construction Funds	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
5.24 Continuation	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
5.25 Budget Flexibility	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

This table may be used as follows: Assume that one wants to know the answer to, "Do projects with smaller budgets have more difficulty finding and holding qualified personnel than projects with larger budgets?" Looking under the independent variable of "Budget" and 2.11, "Finding and holding qualified personnel," one finds that the hypothesis is rejected, hence there is a significant difference; hence projects with smaller budgets do have significantly more difficulty in holding qualified personnel than projects with larger budgets.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

As an aspect of the first national study of ESEA Title III, a survey questionnaire was sent during the Fall of 1966 to all PACE directors. The replies from this instrument proved to be most helpful and they were used in the first report—the one published by the Senate Subcommittee on Education.

It is time again to take stock of PACE through this procedure, as an aspect of the second national study of this title. I sincerely hope that you will take some minutes from your busy life to help us. The validity of this instrument can be no greater than the care each respondent takes in answering a variety of questions.

The questionnaire is anonymous; analyses of the data will be used in a major report on the PACE program.

Could you respond within one week?

Many thanks in advance.

Please return to:

Richard I. Miller
Director, Program on Educational Change
College of Education
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

1. Project Characteristics

(1.0) Which one of the following categories best describes the scope of your project? Check only one

_____(1.01) National
_____(1.02) Regional (multi-state)
_____(1.03) One State
_____(1.04) One District
_____(1.05) Multi-district; meaning two to six districts
_____(1.06) Multi-district (or county); meaning seven or more districts within one state
_____(1.07) A few schools within one district
_____(1.08) One school

(1.1) Which one of the descriptors listed below best describes area served by your project? Check only one

Urban

_____(1.10) Central City
_____(1.11) Urban Fringe

Other Urban (suburban)

_____(1.12) Cities of 10,000 or more
_____(1.13) Cities of 2,500 to 10,000

Rural

_____(1.14) Towns of 1,000 to 2,500
_____(1.15) Other Rural

(1.2) Type of activity Check only one

_____(1.20) Mostly services to several local school districts, such as administration, dissemination, planning, and developing.
_____(1.21) Mostly instruction or services directly to pupils, such as arts, sciences, social studies, mobile demonstrations, museum visits, ETV, outdoor camping, and guidance and counseling.

_____(1.22) Mostly services to teachers and principals—services such as instructional materials, audio-visual, demonstrations, and in-service training.

_____(1.23) Mostly planning, such as surveying needs, designing new programs, and visiting innovations.

_____(1.24) Mostly installation of one or two innovations in one or two schools—innovations such as ITA, computer-assisted instruction, teaching aides, parent involvement, job placement, and new courses.

(1.3) How would you classify your project?

_____(1.30) Focusing upon a single idea or program.

_____(1.31) Serving as a supplementary education center with several activities.

(1.4) What is your operational budget for the 1968 fiscal year?

_____

2. Project Operation

(2.0) What have been the four most difficult problems encountered by your project in its operation? Please respond to both (a) and (b).

(a) Place a "1" beside the most difficult problem; a "2" beside the second most difficult one; a "3" beside the third most difficult one; and a "4" beside the fourth most difficult one. Do not use more than four numbers. In other words, a fifth, sixth, etc., degree of difficulty is not sought.

(b) Place an "0" beside those descriptors that have caused no special problems or difficulties.

_____(2.00) Acceptance and cooperation on part of administrators, teachers, community, schools boards.

_____(2.01) Adequate time for planning.

_____(2.02) Adequate time for orienting and training personnel.

_____(2.03) Administering the program: coordination of various programs and activities.
_____(2.04) Budget problems, such as unseen needs.
_____(2.05) Communication problems: keeping in touch with school system and others.
_____(2.06) Continuation after present funding is terminated.
_____(2.07) Delay in funding and in approving modifications.
_____(2.08) Delivery problems with equipment and materials.
_____(2.09) Dissemination.
_____(2.10) Evaluation.
_____(2.11) Finding and holding qualified personnel.
_____(2.12) Keeping the project "on schedule."
_____(2.13) Problems of space and facilities.
_____(2.14) Red tape and paperwork to satisfy local school system.
_____(2.15) Red tape and paperwork to satisfy state department of education.
_____(2.16) Red tape and paperwork to satisfy USOE.

(3.0) Which of the factors given below should be given primary emphasis by the state department of education in deciding upon whether or not to approve new projects?

Please check as many or as few as you wish.

Place a "1" before those descriptors that you recommend most strongly; place a "2" before those that you recommend strongly; and place a "0" before those that you believe are not important.

_____(3.00) Geographical considerations: those areas without ongoing PACE projects should have priority.
_____(3.01) Innovativeness and creativity as primary concerns.
_____(3.02) Merits of proposal in terms of design and quality potential should be the deciding factor.
_____(3.03) Needs of the area: projects to fill definitely established gaps or needs in ongoing school programs.

(3.1) What criteria do you believe <u>should</u> be given primary weight in evaluating the overall effectiveness of <u>your</u> program?

Please place a "1" by the descriptor that you believe should be given most weight; a "2" by the second most important factor; and a "3" by the third most important. Use only a first, second, and third choice. Place a "0" before those that you believe are <u>not</u> important.

_____(3.10) Constructive change (improvement) in local education.
_____(3.11) Demonstration of program.
_____(3.12) Development of functional student skills.
_____(3.13) Development of interest, acceptance, and involvement.
_____(3.14) Dissemination of program.
_____(3.15) Innovative and creative (development of new ideas and approaches).
_____(3.16) Local or extramural funding for continuation of project after PACE funds expire.
_____(3.17) Meeting area needs.
_____(3.18) Meeting objectives set forth in proposal.
_____(3.19) Planning and evaluation service to local school districts.
_____(3.20) Producing desirable results.
_____(3.21) Serving a sizeable number of pupils.

(4.0) A substantial portion (75%) of the ESEA Title III funds will be turned over to state departments of education for administration. From your perspective, what is likely to be the <u>greatest</u> <u>advantage</u> from this decision?

_____

_____

_____

(4. 1) What is likely to be the greatest weakness from this decision?

_____

_____

_____

(4. 2) PACE <u>has been</u> essentially a federal-to-local program. From what you have learned about direct federal-local relations from your dealings with Washington, is federal control a distinct possibility or an exaggerated and largely fictional fear?

_____

_____

_____

(4. 3) Do you favor <u>more</u> or <u>less</u> federal participation in education <u>based upon your experience</u> with PACE?

_____

_____

_____

(5. 0) How would you rate <u>YOUR</u> project in terms of these four objectives?

<u>Use a percentage of success figure</u>. (The percentage figures may range anywhere from "0" to "100" percent.)

_____(5. 00) Does PACE encourage school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems?

_____(5. 01) Does PACE facilitate demonstration of worthwhile innovations in educational practice through exemplary programs?

_____(5. 02) Does PACE assist school programs in more effective utilization of latest knowledge about learning and teaching?

_____(5.03) Has it contributed to the creation, design, and intelligent use of supplementary centers and services?

(5.1) How would you rate <u>PACE</u> <u>in general</u> in terms of these four objectives?

<u>Use a percentage of success figure</u>. (The percentage figures may range anywhere from "0" to "100.")

_____(5.10) Does PACE encourage school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems?

_____(5.11) Does PACE facilitate demonstration of worthwhile innovations in educational practice through exemplary programs?

_____(5.12) Does PACE assist school programs in more effective utilization of latest knowledge about learning and teaching?

_____(5.13) Has it contributed to the creation, design, and intelligent use of supplementary centers and services?

(5.2) What ideas and suggestions would you offer for future developments of Title III?

Please mark as many or as few as you wish; place a "1" before those ideas and suggestions that you recommend most strongly; place a "2" before those that you recommend strongly. Use only a "1" or a "2" to indicate your views on importance. Place a "0" before those points that do not have importance, in your opinion.

_____(5.20) Allot more funds to PACE.

_____(5.21) Clearer and simpler guidelines and proposal forms.

_____(5.22) Closer relationship of PACE projects with other ESEA titles and other grant programs.

_____(5.23) Construction funds made available.

_____(5.24) Continuation of project funding beyond three years.

_____(5.25) More flexibility within the budget.